DOI:
10.1093/schbul/sby116

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

LA bias, momentary aberrant salience, and psychosis: an experimental experience sampling study

Authors:

Ulrich Reininghaus[a,b], Margaret Oorschot[a], Steffen Moritz[c], Charlotte Gayer-Anderson[b], Matthew J. Kempton[d], Lucia Valmaggia[e,f], Philip McGuire[d,f], Robin Murray[d,f], Philippa Garety[e,f], Til Wykes[d,f], Craig Morgan[b,f], Inez Myin-Germeys[g]

[a]Department of Psychiatry and Psychology, School for Mental Health and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, The Netherlands; [b]Centre for Epidemiology and Public Health, Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK; [c]Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; [d]Department of Psychosis Studies, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College, London, UK; [e]Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College, London, UK; [f]National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Mental Health Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London; [g]Department of Neurosciences, Psychiatry Research Group, Center for Contextual Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Belgium

Correspondence to: Dr Ulrich Reininghaus, Department of Psychiatry and Psychology, School for Mental Health and Neuroscience, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616 (VIJV1), 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands; Tel: +31 (0) 43388 3896, fax: 31-43-388-4122,

E-mail: u.reininghaus@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Word count (Abstract): 250

Word count (Text): 3,998

Abstract

Cognitive models of psychosis posit that reasoning biases are an important mechanism contributing to the formation of psychotic symptoms, in part through transforming anomalous experiences of aberrant salience into frank psychotic symptoms. This study aimed to investigate the interplay of liberal acceptance (LA) bias, which is a specific type of reasoning bias, and momentary aberrant salience in the development of paranoid and psychotic experiences in daily life in first-episode psychosis patients (FEP), At-Risk Mental State participants (ARMS), and controls. We used a novel experimental Experience Sampling Methodology (eESM) task for measuring LA bias (i.e., decisions based on low probability estimates) and ESM measures of momentary aberrant salience, paranoid and psychotic experiences in 51 FEP, 46 ARMS, and 53 controls. We found evidence that LA bias was more likely to occur in FEP than in controls. Further, LA bias was associated with psychotic and paranoid experiences (all $p<0.007$) and modified the association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences ($\chi^2(df)=7.4(2)$, $p=0.025$) in ARMS, such that momentary salience was associated with more intense psychotic experiences in the presence of LA bias in ARMS, but not in FEP and controls. Our findings suggest that LA bias may be central for anomalous experiences such as momentary aberrant salience to increase intensity of psychotic experiences in at-risk individuals. Further, LA bias appears to be more likely to be present, but not directly linked to current intensity of psychotic experiences, in treated FEP. Novel eESM tasks open new avenues for targeting psychological processes under real-world conditions.

Key words: Reasoning bias, aberrant salience, experimental experience sampling methodology, prodrome, first-episode psychosis

Introduction

Schizophrenia and other psychoses are disorders with complex phenomenology and aetiology. Individuals often present with multifaceted symptoms, which extend phenomenologically and temporally from subclinical psychotic experiences to psychotic disorder.[1,2] Recent factor analytic work suggests one transdiagnostic and five specific symptom dimensions of psychosis.[3-5] Arguably, this requires reducing heterogeneity by focusing on specific psychological mechanisms and psychotic symptoms[6,7] and targeting these at an early stage for achieving better outcomes of psychosis.[8-11] Cognitive models of psychosis suggest that reasoning biases are an important mechanism contributing to the formation of psychotic symptoms.[7,12,13] It has further been posited that reasoning biases distort the appraisal of disturbing anomalous experiences such as experiences of aberrant novelty and salience and, thereby, contribute to the transformation of these anomalous experiences into frank psychotic symptoms, most prominently paranoid delusions and hallucinations.[7,13]

Recently, a specific type of reasoning bias, i.e., liberal acceptance (LA) bias (or, alternatively, a lowered decision threshold), has received more attention.[14-17] While the most widely studied reasoning bias to date, i.e., a tendency of jumping to conclusions, has been defined as a bias to use fewer data to reach a decision,[7,11,18-21] LA bias refers to a tendency of making premature decisions based on low subjective probability estimates.[14,16] One of the paradigms to investigate LA bias has built on a task inspired by the television show *'Who Wants to Be a* Millionaire' developed by Moritz et al.[16] This forced choice reasoning task requires individuals to provide probability estimates on four alternative response options to knowledge questions and, in a next step, asks whether or not they want to make a decision in favour of one of the four alternative responses. Reasoning bias in this task is indexed by premature decisions, defined as decisions for one of the alternative responses based on low probability estimates (i.e., liberal acceptance).[16] One advantage of this task may be

that it is unlikely to be poor motivation that would account for premature decisions as it does not impact completion time.[16]

There is still only a limited amount of research to investigate LA bias in psychosis.[14] However, the evidence that there is suggests that LA bias is more likely to occur in patients with psychosis.[14] In our recent Experience Sampling Methodology (ESM) study,[9] we found that momentary aberrant salience was associated with psychotic experiences in daily life, and this association was greatest in individuals with an At-Risk Mental State for psychosis (ARMS).[2,9,22] However, whether or not, and if so how exactly, reasoning biases such as liberal acceptance may interact with, and modify, experiences of aberrant salience to transform them into psychotic symptoms, remains to be elucidated.[7,23,24] While affective disturbances are given an increasingly prominent role in cognitive models of psychosis,[7,23] mood does not seem to be directly linked to LA bias.[15] Also, the role of LA bias has yet to be examined in individuals with ARMS or first-episode psychosis (FEP), which would allow us to minimize the consequences of illness chronicity and elucidate the influence of LA bias across different stages of early psychosis.

Even though several studies have examined reasoning biases in psychosis, no study that we are aware of has investigated what role these biases play in individuals' daily life, outside the research laboratory. This may be particularly relevant given reasoning biases may potentially vary within individuals over time and across different contexts. Hence, the generalisability of findings from research conducted to date to real-world contexts remains limited. This is, however, key if we are to better understand which psychological mechanisms to target in individuals' real lives as a basis for achieving more sustainable change and improving outcomes under real-world conditions.[8]

We used a novel experimental Experience Sampling Methodology (eESM) design that would allow us to administer a forced choice reasoning task to assess presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias over

time under real-world conditions (using a modified version of the task developed by Moritz et al.[16]) and, thereby, advance on previous research by simultaneously optimizing both internal and external validity.[8] Our aim was to investigate the interplay of LA bias,[16] and momentary aberrant salience in the development of paranoid and psychotic experiences in daily life using this eESM task for measuring presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias in FEP, ARMS, and controls. To this end, we sought to test the following hypotheses:

I) LA bias in daily life is more likely to be present and fluctuate in FEP and ARMS than in controls;

II) **1)** within each group (FEP, ARMS, controls), presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias is associated with more intense **i)** psychotic experiences and **ii)** paranoid experiences in daily life, and **2)** these associations are greater in **a)** FEP than in controls, **b)** ARMS than controls, and **c)** FEP than ARMS;

III) the association of experiences of momentary aberrant salience with more intense **i)** psychotic experiences (as previously reported[8]) and **ii)** paranoid experiences is modified by presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias in daily life, such that: **1)** within each group (FEP, ARMS, controls), these associations are greater in the presence vs. absence of (and high vs. low fluctuations in) LA bias, and **2)** this difference in associations in the presence vs. absence of (and high vs. low fluctuations in) LA bias is greater still in **a)** FEP than in controls, **b)** ARMS than controls, and **c)** ARMS than FEP; and

IV) presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias is not associated with affective disturbance in any one group.

Method

Sample

We recruited a sample of FEP, ARMS, and controls identified in the London centre of EU-GEI[25] and the Childhood Adversity and Psychosis study.

FEP: Individuals with FEP were recruited from mental health services in defined catchment areas in South-East London, UK.[9] Inclusion criteria were: resident in defined catchment areas; aged 18-64; presence of a FEP, based on the OPerational CRITeria system (OPCRIT);[3,26] and adequate command of the English language. Exclusion criteria were: psychotic symptoms precipitated by an organic cause; and transient psychotic symptoms resulting from acute intoxication. Participants in hospital at time of consent completed ESM assessments after discharge.

ARMS: Individuals with ARMS were recruited from South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, West London Mental Health NHS Trust, and a community survey of General Practitioner (GP) practices.[9] Inclusion criteria were: presence of an ARMS based on the CAARMS[2,9] or the SPI-A[9,27-29] (see Supplementary Table 1); aged 18-35; and adequate command of the English language. Exclusion criteria were: psychotic episode for more than one week as determined by the CAARMS and Structured Clinical Interview for DSM Disorders (SCID)[30]; previous treatment with an antipsychotic for a psychotic episode; IQ<60, measured with an adapted version of the WAIS.[25,31]

Controls: Controls were recruited using the national postal address file and GP lists as sampling frames. Inclusion criteria were: resident in the same areas as FEP; aged 18-64; adequate command of the English language. Exclusion criteria for controls were the same as for FEP with the addition of the following: personal/family history of psychotic disorder[32]; presence of psychotic symptoms, assessed with the Psychosis Screening Questionnaire[33]; presence of an ARMS (see above criteria).[9]

Data collection

Basic sample characteristics

Data on socio-demographic characteristics were collected using a socio-demographic schedule.[25,34] DSM-IV diagnoses of psychotic disorder were made based on structured examination of case records

using OPCRIT[3,26] as part of the EU-GEI "Functional Enviromics" study.[25] The SCID was used in the ARMS sample to assess current comorbid affective disorders[30] as part of the EU-GEI High-Risk study.[25]

ESM measures

Data on psychotic experiences, paranoia, momentary aberrant salience, and negative affect were collected using a time-based ESM design with ten assessments scheduled at random within set blocks of time over six consecutive days.[9] All participants were given an electronic device (PsyMate®). A detailed description of the ESM procedure and measures[9,16,35-43] is shown in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1]

eESM task: LA bias

We used a novel eESM task for measuring presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias in individuals' daily life based on a modified version of the task developed by Moritz et al.[16] The eESM task is described in detail in Table 1. LA bias was defined as a bias towards making premature decisions and, more specifically, as making any decision and, in its more marked form, an incorrect decision based on a deviation in participants' likelihood estimations of a given response being correct from the 'rational' estimate (or, in other words, a lowered decision threshold), consistent with event probability estimation tasks.[36] The task was scheduled at the end of the ESM assessment of other ESM measures using the same time-based design with assessments scheduled at random within set blocks of time.

Statistical analysis

ESM data have a multilevel structure with multiple observations (level-1) nested within participants (level-2). We used the '`melogit`' and '`mixed`' commands in Stata 14[44] to estimate mixed effects

models for binary and continuous outcomes with random slopes, respectively, while controlling for potential confounders (i.e., age, gender, level of education). These models were estimated using restricted maximum likelihood estimation, which provides unbiased estimates using all available data under the assumption that data is missing at random and if all variables associated with missing values are included in the model.[9, 45, 46] First, in order to investigate whether LA bias in daily life is more likely to be present in FEP and ARMS than in controls (hypothesis I), we fitted models with group as the independent variable and presence (vs. absence) of LA bias as the binary outcome variable. We next fitted separate mixed effects models with i) psychotic experiences and ii) paranoid experiences as continuous outcome variables and presence of LA bias as binary independent variable, and added two-way LA bias × group interactions to test hypothesis II. We further estimated models with momentary aberrant salience as independent variable and psychotic experiences as continuous outcome variable and added two-way (aberrant salience × LA bias, aberrant salience × group, LA bias × group) and three-way (aberrant salience × LA bias × group) interactions to test hypothesis III. Finally, we fitted mixed effects models with negative affect as continuous outcome variable and presence of LA bias as binary independent variable to test hypothesis IV.

Results

Basic sample characteristics

We assessed a total of 165 participants (59 FEP, 51 ARMS, 55 controls) with the ESM during the study period. ESM assessment (with ≥20 valid responses) was completed by 150 participants (51 FEP, 46 ARMS, 53 controls) (Table 2). Psychotic experiences, paranoid experiences, experiences of momentary aberrant salience, and affective disturbances were more common in FEP and ARMS than in controls (Supplementary Table 2).

[Insert Table 2]

LA bias in FEP, ARMS, and controls

Table 3 shows findings on LA bias as measured with the eESM task in FEP, ARMS, and controls. We found evidence that LA bias, characterized by making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates, was two times more likely to be present in FEP than in controls (adjusted odds ratio (aOR) 2.11, p=0.043), while controlling for age and gender. This finding broadly held, at trend level (p=0.066), with some attenuation in magnitude (aOR 1.98), when additionally adjusting for educational level. LA bias was no more likely to occur in ARMS than in controls (OR 1.63, p=0.186).

[Insert Table 3]

When we examined LA bias characterized by making *incorrect* decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates, LA bias so defined was more than three times more likely to be present in FEP than in controls, while controlling for age, gender, and educational level (Table 3). Further, compared with controls, LA bias (based on *incorrect* decisions) was more than two times more likely to be present in ARMS after adjustment for age and gender (aOR 2.51, p=0.039), but was attenuated in magnitude (aOR 2.04) and no longer statistically significant (p=0.112) after controlling for educational level. Overall, a very similar pattern was evident for findings on fluctuations in LA bias in FEP, ARMS, and controls over time (Supplementary Table 3-5).

Association of LA bias with psychotic and paranoid experiences

Findings on the association between LA bias on the one hand, and psychotic and paranoid experiences, on the other, in FEP, ARMS, and controls are displayed in Table 4. There was strong evidence that LA bias (based on any decision) was associated with more intense psychotic experiences (adjusted β (aβ)=0.27, p=0.005) in ARMS. This association fell short of statistical

significance in both FEP and controls. We found only some evidence that this association was greater in ARMS than in controls (aβ=0.24, p=0.082) and lower in FEP than in ARMS (adj. β=-0.22, p=0.081).

[Insert Table 4]

Strong evidence was observed in ARMS, but not in FEP and controls, that LA bias (based on any decision) was associated with more intense paranoid experiences (aβ=0.39, p=0.009) (Table 4). This association tended to be greater in ARMS than in controls (aβ=0.48, p=0.026; Wald test, p=0.080). Again, a very similar pattern of findings was observed for the association of fluctuations in LA bias with psychotic and paranoid experiences (Supplementary Table 4).

We found no evidence that LA bias, characterized by making *incorrect* decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates, was associated with psychotic or paranoid experiences in any one group (Table 4).

Association of momentary aberrant salience with psychotic and paranoid experiences by LA bias and group

When we examined whether the previously reported association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences was modified by presence of LA bias (based on any decision) in FEP, ARMS, and controls (Table 5), there was strong evidence that this association was greater in the presence vs. absence of LA bias (aβ=0.13, p=0.008) in ARMS, but no evidence that this association was modified by LA bias in FEP and controls (Wald test, , p=0.025). The difference in the magnitude of associations of momentary aberrant salience with psychotic experiences in the presence vs. absence of LA bias was significantly greater in ARMS than in controls (aβ=0.16, p=0.034) and in ARMS than in FEP (aβ=0.17, p=0.017). There was no evidence that the association between aberrant salience and paranoid experiences was modified by LA bias and group. The pattern of findings on

associations of aberrant salience with psychotic and paranoid experiences by fluctuations in LA bias and group was very similar (Supplementary Table 5).

[Insert Table 5]

Association of LA bias with affective disturbance

As can be seen in Table 4, we found no evidence that LA bias was associated with more intense negative affect in any one group and that these associations varied across FEP, ARMS, and controls.

Discussion

Principal findings

This study advances on previous research by using, for the first time, an eESM design to investigate liberal acceptance as a specific type of reasoning bias in the daily lives of people with FEP and ARMS in comparison with controls. Our findings lent support to our first hypothesis that LA bias in daily life was more likely to occur (and fluctuate) in FEP than in controls, but much less strong and consistent support that LA bias was more likely to occur (and fluctuate) in ARMS than in controls. When we examined our second hypothesis, we found evidence that presence of, and fluctuations in, LA bias was associated with an increased intensity of psychotic and paranoid experiences in ARMS and some evidence, at trend level, that this association was greater in ARMS than in controls. Probing these findings further, there was evidence from analyses testing our third hypothesis that LA bias modified the association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences, such that this association was greater in the presence of, and greater fluctuations in, LA bias in ARMS, but not in FEP and controls. Finally, we found no evidence that LA bias was associated with affective disturbance in any one group.

Methodological considerations

This study used a novel eESM task, which operationalized LA bias based on a forced choice reasoning task and, thus, did not allow for investigating other aspects of reasoning biases such as the formal criterion of draws-to-decision in the beads task. However, this task yielded several methodological advances on previous research. These included measuring LA bias repeatedly over time without learning effects, keeping the potential impact of poor motivation to a minimum (as premature decisions did not affect completion time or length of task) and, probably most importantly, delivering, for the first time, an experimental task for measuring cognitive bias under real-world conditions. While this novel task showed very good concurrent validity with psychotic experiences and clinical status, subsequent studies now need to compare eESM and conventional tasks of cognitive bias to elucidate their convergent validity.

The eESM task asked participants to provide probability estimates on response options to knowledge questions, so perhaps not unsurprisingly the magnitude of ORs was attenuated for the presence of LA bias in ARMS individuals (and to a degree, in FEP individuals) compared with controls when controlling for confounding by education level. We cannot rule out, however, that the latter may have indexed in part aspects of the cognitive impairments that form part of the psychopathology of psychosis and, hence, explain some of the attenuation in ORs. Future research should further investigate this link between LA bias, educational level, and IQ and what role difficulty of task, developmental age and dosage of antipsychotics may play for the association between LA bias and psychotic experiences. Notably, the association between LA bias and psychotic experiences in ARMS held independently of, and thus was not confounded by, educational level. One reason for p-values of interactions to reach only trend level despite differences in associations across groups being of large magnitude in the adjusted models may have been limited power.

ESM assessment is time intensive and data collection may be associated with assessment burden for participants. The ESM measure for assessing paranoid experiences consisted of only one item. While this item did not cover the full breadth of paranoid experiences and, arguably, a clearer pattern of findings may have been observed using a more detailed measure, brevity of ESM measures allowed us to balance burden of intensive longitudinal ESM assessment. Also, good concurrent validity was observed for this measure of paranoid experiences with ESM measures of psychotic experiences, negative affect and threat anticipation (Table 1).

Comparison with previous research

Numerous studies have investigated reasoning biases in psychosis but evidence on LA bias and, more generally, the role that reasoning biases play within individuals across different contexts in daily life remained limited. In the current eESM study, we found that liberal acceptance as a specific type of reasoning was two to three times more likely to occur in the daily lives of individuals with FEP than in controls. This is in line with previous research that suggests LA bias is more likely to occur in people with psychosis compared with healthy controls.[14] We further observed that the increase in the odds of LA bias was more marked in FEP individuals when this was characterized by making *incorrect* decisions based on low probability estimates, which is consistent with findings from the study by Moritz et al.[16]. However, 95% CIs of this finding were within a broadly similar range and included the point estimate of the OR for LA bias defined as making *any* decision based on low probability estimates and, hence, differences in magnitude of ORs need to be interpreted with caution. There was much less strong and consistent evidence that LA bias was more likely to be present in ARMS individuals. This is not too surprising given that only a proportion of those with an ARMS will go on to develop a psychotic disorder[47] and LA bias has been found to be much less relevant in people without mental health problems.[14]

Echoing previous reports in people with an elevated risk for psychosis,[48] we found momentary LA bias to be associated with increased intensity of momentary psychotic and paranoid experiences within ARMS individuals. Our findings on the association of fluctuations in LA bias with psychotic and paranoid experiences in ARMS individuals extended beyond previous research. Further, the absence of an association of LA bias with paranoid (and psychotic) experiences in FEP mirrors earlier findings on LA bias to be present in people with (enduring) psychotic disorder (e.g., schizophrenia, delusional disorder), but not directly linked to current severity of psychotic symptoms (when LA bias was based on correct decisions).[15] A recent repeated measures online survey to investigate jumping to conclusions as another important reasoning bias did, however, report such a link in a small sample of people with enduring psychosis.[49] There was also no evidence in any one group that LA bias, characterized by making *incorrect* decisions based on low probability estimates, was associated with psychotic or paranoid experiences. Garety and Freeman[20] emphasized that probabilistic reasoning is a useful framework for investigating the nature of paranoid and psychotic symptom development precisely because "…it does not simply measure valid conclusions or errors, but assesses the way conclusions are reached" (Garety and Freeman,[20] p. 123). Our finding seems to support this point as *any,* rather than specifically incorrect, decisions based on low probability estimates were associated with an increased intensity of paranoid and psychotic experiences in ARMS individuals.

This finding in ARMS individuals became even more revealing when viewed in the context of momentary aberrant salience, which we have previously reported may be particularly relevant to intensity of psychotic experiences in this population.[9] Aberrant assignment of salience to otherwise irrelevant stimuli has been theorized to be the result of excess striatal dopamine, and psychotic experiences to emerge as a "top-down" cognitive attempt to make sense of these aberrantly salient experiences, which have further been linked to altered reward processing[50-56]. While there has been controversial debate about the number of cognitive alterations that give rise to delusions,[57, 58] (some) cognitive models of psychosis[7, 13] posit that the presence of reasoning biases is key for

anomalous experiences of aberrant salience to transform into frank psychotic symptoms. In line with these models, we found that experiences of momentary salience were associated with more intense psychotic experiences in the presence of, and greater fluctuations in, LA bias in ARMS individuals without any prior treatment with antipsychotics for a psychotic episode. However, there was no evidence that this association was modified by LA bias in FEP individuals, who all but one had received treatment with antipsychotics, which have been theorized to reduce experiences of aberrant salience through their effect on elevated dopamine function.[54, 59] This tentatively suggests that LA bias may be central for aberrant salience to initially increase intensity of psychotic experiences in at-risk individuals, but less relevant for aberrant salience to maintain symptoms in treated FEP individuals.

Finally, while affective disturbances play an important role in the aetiology of psychosis, as we have recently reported in daily life,[8, 60] consistent with previous research,[24] we did not find negative affect to be directly linked to LA bias.

Conclusions

Our findings suggest that LA bias in daily life may be most relevant to increase intensity of psychotic experiences in ARMS individuals and may be central for anomalous experiences such as experiences of aberrant salience to be associated with more intense psychotic experiences. Moreover, LA bias in daily life appears to be more likely to occur and, hence, to be most pronounced, in individuals with a first-episode of psychotic disorder, but, in treated FEP individuals, does not seem to be directly linked to an increased intensity of, and maintain, psychotic experiences. The current study further illustrates that the scope of eESM tasks for measuring fluctuations in not only reasoning biases but also other psychological processes under real-world conditions is considerable and may help improve our understanding of these processes in the development of psychosis. Novel eESM tasks further open new avenues for identifying and targeting the dynamic of basic psychological

dimensions in daily life. An important next step will be to conduct clinical translational research using ecological interventionist causal models for modifying reasoning bias (and other psychological processes) in daily life through novel, personalized ecological momentary interventions[8, 61] in the early stages of symptom development and, thereby, prevent transformation of anomalous experiences into full-blown psychotic symptoms.

Funding

This work was supported by a Veni grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (grant no. 451-13-022) and a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship of the UK National Institute for Health Research (grant no. NIHR-PDF-201104065) to UR. The work was also supported by funding from the Wellcome Trust (WT087417) to CM and is an approved add-on study of the "The European Network of National Networks studying Gene-Environment Interactions in Schizophrenia" (EU-GEI), which is supported by funding from the European Union (European Community's Seventh Framework Program [HEALTH-F2-2009–241909; Project EU-GEI]). The authors acknowledge financial support from the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre for Mental Health at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

References

1. Linscott RJ, van Os J. An updated and conservative systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiological evidence on psychotic experiences in children and adults: on the pathway from proneness to persistence to dimensional expression across mental disorders. *Psychol Med.* 2013;43(6):1133-1149.

2. Yung AR, Yuen HP, McGorry PD, Phillips LJ, Kelly D, Dell'Olio M, Francey SM, Cosgrave EM, Killackey E, Stanford C, Godfrey K, Buckby J. Mapping the onset of psychosis: the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry.* 2005;39(11-12):964-971.

3. Reininghaus U, Bohnke JR, Hosang G, Farmer A, Burns T, McGuffin P, Bentall RP. Evaluation of the validity and utility of a transdiagnostic psychosis dimension encompassing schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2016;209(2):107-113.

4. Reininghaus U, Priebe S, Bentall RP. Testing the psychopathology of psychosis: evidence for a general psychosis dimension. *Schizophr Bull.* 2013;39(4):884-895.

5. Shevlin M, McElroy E, Bentall RP, Reininghaus U, Murphy J. The psychosis continuum: testing a bifactor model of psychosis in a general population sample. *Schizophr Bull.* 2016.

6. Cannon TD, Keller MC. Endophenotypes in the genetic analyses of mental disorders. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol.* 2006;2:267-290.

7. Garety PA, Bebbington P, Fowler D, Freeman D, Kuipers E. Implications for neurobiological research of cognitive models of psychosis: a theoretical paper. *Psychol Med.* 2007;37(10):1377-1391.

8. Reininghaus U, Depp CA, Myin-Germeys I. Ecological interventionist causal models in psychosis: targeting psychological mechanisms in daily life. *Schizophr Bull.* 2016;42(2):264-269.

9. Reininghaus U, Kempton MJ, Valmaggia L, Craig TK, Garety P, Onyejiaka A, Gayer-Anderson C, So SH, Hubbard K, Beards S, Dazzan P, Pariante C, Mondelli V, Fisher HL, Mills JG, Viechtbauer W, McGuire P, van Os J, Murray RM, Wykes T, Myin-Germeys I, Morgan C. Stress sensitivity, aberrant salience, and threat anticipation in early psychosis: an experience sampling study. *Schizophr Bull.* 2016;42(3):712-722.

10. Garety PA, Fowler DG, Freeman D, Bebbington P, Dunn G, Kuipers E. Cognitive--behavioural therapy and family intervention for relapse prevention and symptom reduction in psychosis: randomised controlled trial. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2008;192(6):412-423.

11. Garety P, Waller H, Emsley R, Jolley S, Kuipers E, Bebbington P, Dunn G, Fowler D, Hardy A, Freeman D. Cognitive mechanisms of change in delusions: an experimental investigation targeting reasoning to effect change in paranoia. *Schizophr Bull.* 2015;41(2):400-410.

12. Freeman D, Garety P. Advances in understanding and treating persecutory delusions: a review. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2014;49(8):1179-1189.

13. Garety PA, Kuipers E, Fowler D, Freeman D, Bebbington PE. A cognitive model of the positive symptoms of psychosis. *Psychol Med.* 2001;31(2):189-195.

14. Moritz S, Pfuhl G, Ludtke T, Menon M, Balzan RP, Andreou C. A two-stage cognitive theory of the positive symptoms of psychosis. Highlighting the role of lowered decision thresholds. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry.* 2017;56:12-20.

15. Moritz S, Veckenstedt R, Randjbar S, Hottenrott B, Woodward TS, von Eckstaedt FV, Schmidt C, Jelinek L, Lincoln TM. Decision making under uncertainty and mood induction: further evidence for liberal acceptance in schizophrenia. *Psychol Med.* 2009;39(11):1821-1829.

16. Moritz S, Woodward TS, Hausmann D. Incautious reasoning as a pathogenetic factor for the development of psychotic symptoms in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull.* 2006;32(2):327-331.

17. Moritz S, Woodward TS, Jelinek L, Klinge R. Memory and metamemory in schizophrenia: a liberal acceptance account of psychosis. *Psychol Med.* 2008;38(6):825-832.

18. Lincoln TM, Ziegler M, Mehl S, Rief W. The jumping to conclusions bias in delusions: specificity and changeability. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 2010;119(1):40-49.

19. Moritz S, Woodward TS. Jumping to conclusions in delusional and non-delusional schizophrenic patients. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2005;44(Pt 2):193-207.

20. Garety PA, Freeman D. Cognitive approaches to delusions: a critical review of theories and evidence. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 1999;38 (Pt 2):113-154.

21. Ward T, Garety PA. Fast and slow thinking in distressing delusions: A review of the literature and implications for targeted therapy. *Schizophr Res.* 2017.

22. Fusar-Poli P, Borgwardt S, Bechdolf A, Addington J, Riecher-Rossler A, Schultze-Lutter F, Keshavan M, Wood S, Ruhrmann S, Seidman LJ, Valmaggia L, Cannon T, Velthorst E, De Haan L, Cornblatt B, Bonoldi I, Birchwood M, McGlashan T, Carpenter W, McGorry P, Klosterkotter J, McGuire P, Yung A. The psychosis high-risk state: a comprehensive state-of-the-art review. *JAMA Psychiatry.* 2013;70(1):107-120.

23. Freeman D, Garety PA, Kuipers E, Fowler D, Bebbington PE. A cognitive model of persecutory delusions. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2002;41(Pt 4):331-347.

24. Garety PA, Freeman D, Jolley S, Dunn G, Bebbington PE, Fowler DG, Kuipers E, Dudley R. Reasoning, emotions, and delusional conviction in psychosis. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 2005;114(3):373-384.

25. European Network of National Networks studying Gene-Environment Interactions in Schizophrenia, van Os J, Rutten BP, Myin-Germeys I, Delespaul P, Viechtbauer W, van Zelst C, Bruggeman R, Reininghaus U, Morgan C, Murray RM, Di Forti M, McGuire P, Valmaggia LR, Kempton MJ, Gayer-Anderson C, Hubbard K, Beards S, Stilo SA, Onyejiaka A, Bourque F, Modinos G, Tognin S, Calem M, O'Donovan MC, Owen MJ, Holmans P, Williams N, Craddock N, Richards A, Humphreys I, Meyer-Lindenberg A, Leweke FM, Tost H, Akdeniz C, Rohleder C, Bumb JM, Schwarz E, Alptekin K, Ucok A, Saka MC, Atbasoglu EC, Guloksuz S, Gumus-Akay G, Cihan B, Karadag H, Soygur H, Cankurtaran ES, Ulusoy S, Akdede B, Binbay T, Ayer A, Noyan H, Karadayi G, Akturan E, Ulas H, Arango C, Parellada M, Bernardo M, Sanjuan J, Bobes J, Arrojo M, Santos JL, Cuadrado P, Rodriguez Solano JJ, Carracedo A, Garcia Bernardo E, Roldan L, Lopez G, Cabrera B, Cruz S, Diaz Mesa EM, Pouso M, Jimenez E, Sanchez T, Rapado M, Gonzalez E, Martinez C, Sanchez E, Olmeda MS, de Haan L, Velthorst E, van der Gaag M, Selten JP, van Dam D, van der Ven E, van der Meer F, Messchaert E, Kraan T, Burger N, Leboyer M, Szoke A, Schurhoff F, Llorca PM, Jamain S, Tortelli A, Frijda F, Vilain J, Galliot AM, Baudin G, Ferchiou A, Richard JR, Bulzacka E, Charpeaud T, Tronche AM, De Hert M, van Winkel R, Decoster J, Derom C, Thiery E, Stefanis NC, Sachs G, Aschauer H, Lasser I, Winklbaur B, Schlogelhofer M, Riecher-Rossler A, Borgwardt S, Walter A, Harrisberger F, Smieskova R, Rapp C, Ittig S, Soguel-dit-Piquard F, Studerus E, Klosterkotter J, Ruhrmann S, Paruch J, Julkowski D, Hilboll D, Sham PC, Cherny SS, Chen EY, Campbell DD, Li M, Romeo-Casabona CM, Emaldi Cirion A, Urruela Mora A, Jones P, Kirkbride J, Cannon M, Rujescu D, Tarricone I, Berardi D, Bonora E, Seri M, Marcacci T, Chiri L, Chierzi F, Storbini V, Braca M, Minenna MG, Donegani I, Fioritti A, La Barbera D, La Cascia CE, Mule A, Sideli L, Sartorio R, Ferraro L, Tripoli G, Seminerio F, Marinaro AM, McGorry P, Nelson B, Amminger GP, Pantelis C, Menezes PR, Del-Ben CM, Gallo Tenan SH, Shuhama R, Ruggeri M, Tosato S, Lasalvia A, Bonetto C, Ira E, Nordentoft M, Krebs MO, Barrantes-Vidal N, Cristobal P, Kwapil TR, Brietzke E, Bressan RA, Gadelha A, Maric NP, Andric S, Mihaljevic M, Mirjanic T. Identifying gene-environment interactions in schizophrenia: contemporary challenges for integrated, large-scale investigations. *Schizophr Bull.* 2014;40(4):729-736.

26. McGuffin P, Farmer A, Harvey I. A polydiagnostic application of operational criteria in studies of psychotic illness. Development and reliability of the OPCRIT system. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1991;48(8):764-770.

27. Klosterkotter J, Schultze-Lutter F, Bechdolf A, Ruhrmann S. Prediction and prevention of schizophrenia: what has been achieved and where to go next? *World Psychiatry.* 2011;10(3):165-174.

28. Mills JG. *Defining the prevalence of subjects at Ultra High Risk of developing psychosis in the general population.* London, King's College London; 2014.

29. Schultze-Lutter F, Ruhrmann S, Fusar-Poli P, Bechdolf A, Schimmelmann BG, Klosterkotter J. Basic symptoms and the prediction of first-episode psychosis. *Curr Pharm Des.* 2012;18(4):351-357.

30. First MB, Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, Williams JBW. *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV-TR Axis I Disorders.* . New York: Biometrics Research, New York State Psychiatric Institute; 2002.

31. Ryan JJ, Weilage ME, Spaulding WD. Accuracy of the seven subtest WAIS-R short form in chronic schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res.* 1999;39(1):79-83.

32. Maxwell E. Manual for the Family Interview of Genetic Studies (FIGS). St. Louis: Center for Collaborative Genetic Studies on Mental Disorders; 1992.

33. Bebbington P, Nayani T. The Psychosis Screening Questionnaire. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res.* 1995;5(1):11-19.

34. Mallet R. *Sociodemographic schedule*. London, UK: Section of Social Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry; 1997.

35. Delespaul P, deVries M, van Os J. Determinants of occurrence and recovery from hallucinations in daily life. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol.* 2002;37(3):97-104.

36. Huq SF, Garety PA, Hemsley DR. Probabilistic judgements in deluded and non-deluded subjects. *Q J Exp Psychol A.* 1988;40(4):801-812.

37. Lardinois M, Lataster T, Mengelers R, Van Os J, Myin-Germeys I. Childhood trauma and increased stress sensitivity in psychosis. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.* 2011;123(1):28-35.

38. Myin-Germeys I, Marcelis M, Krabbendam L, Delespaul P, van Os J. Subtle fluctuations in psychotic phenomena as functional states of abnormal dopamine reactivity in individuals at risk. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2005;58(2):105-110.

39. Myin-Germeys I, van Os J, Schwartz JE, Stone AA, Delespaul PA. Emotional reactivity to daily life stress in psychosis. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2001;58(12):1137-1144.

40. Palmier-Claus JE, Dunn G, Lewis SW. Emotional and symptomatic reactivity to stress in individuals at ultra-high risk of developing psychosis. *Psychol Med.* 2012;42(5):1003-1012.

41. Palmier-Claus JE, Myin-Germeys I, Barkus E, Bentley L, Udachina A, Delespaul PA, Lewis SW, Dunn G. Experience sampling research in individuals with mental illness: reflections and guidance. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.* 2011;123(1):12-20.

42. So SH. *Change in delusions with treatment and the role of reasoning*. London: King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, University of London; 2012.

43. Myin-Germeys I, Delespaul P, van Os J. Behavioural sensitization to daily life stress in psychosis. *Psychol Med.* 2005;35(5):733-741.

44. StataCorp. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 14*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP; 2015.

45. Little T, Rubin D. *Analysis with Missing Data*. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1987.

46. Mallinckrodt CH, Clark WS, David SR. Accounting for dropout bias using mixed-effects models. *J Biopharm Stat.* 2001;11(1-2):9-21.

47. Fusar-Poli P, Bonoldi I, Yung AR, Borgwardt S, Kempton MJ, Valmaggia L, Barale F, Caverzasi E, McGuire P. Predicting psychosis: meta-analysis of transition outcomes in individuals at high clinical risk. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2012;69(3):220-229.

48. Moritz S, Goritz AS, Gallinat J, Schafschetzy M, Van Quaquebeke N, Peters MJ, Andreou C. Subjective competence breeds overconfidence in errors in psychosis. A hubris account of paranoia. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry.* 2015;48:118-124.

49. Ludtke T, Kriston L, Schroder J, Lincoln TM, Moritz S. Negative affect and a fluctuating jumping to conclusions bias predict subsequent paranoia in daily life: An online experience sampling study. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry.* 2017;56:106-112.

50. Gold JM, Waltz JA, Prentice KJ, Morris SE, Heerey EA. Reward processing in schizophrenia: a deficit in the representation of value. *Schizophr Bull.* 2008;34(5):835-847.
51. Hoffman RE, Woods SW, Hawkins KA, Pittman B, Tohen M, Preda A, Breier A, Glist J, Addington J, Perkins DO, McGlashan TH. Extracting spurious messages from noise and risk of schizophrenia-spectrum disorders in a prodromal population. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2007;191:355-356.
52. Howes OD, Kapur S. The dopamine hypothesis of schizophrenia: version III--the final common pathway. *Schizophr Bull.* 2009;35(3):549-562.
53. Howes OD, Murray RM. Schizophrenia: an integrated sociodevelopmental-cognitive model. *Lancet.* 2014;383(9929):1677-1687.
54. Kapur S. Psychosis as a state of aberrant salience: a framework linking biology, phenomenology, and pharmacology in schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2003;160(1):13-23.
55. Kapur S, Mizrahi R, Li M. From dopamine to salience to psychosis--linking biology, pharmacology and phenomenology of psychosis. *Schizophr Res.* 2005;79(1):59-68.
56. Vercammen A, Aleman A. Semantic expectations can induce false perceptions in hallucination-prone individuals. *Schizophr Bull.* 2010;36(1):151-156.
57. Coltheart M. Cognitive neuropsychiatry and delusional belief. *Q J Exp Psychol (Hove).* 2007;60(8):1041-1062.
58. Corlett PR, Honey GD, Fletcher PC. From prediction error to psychosis: ketamine as a pharmacological model of delusions. *J Psychopharmacol.* 2007;21(3):238-252.
59. Roiser JP, Stephan KE, den Ouden HE, Barnes TR, Friston KJ, Joyce EM. Do patients with schizophrenia exhibit aberrant salience? *Psychol Med.* 2009;39(2):199-209.
60. Klippel A, Myin-Germeys I, Chavez-Baldini U, Preacher KJ, Kempton M, Valmaggia L, Calem M, So S, Beards S, Hubbard K, Gayer-Anderson C, Onyejiaka A, Wichers M, McGuire P, Murray R, Garety P, van Os J, Wykes T, Morgan C, Reininghaus U. Modelling the interplay between psychological processes and adverse, stressful contexts and experiences in pathways to psychosis: an experience sampling study. *Schizophr Bull.* 2017;43(2):302-315.
61. Steinhart H, Myin-Germeys I, Reininghaus U. Translating treatment of mental health problems to daily life: a guide to the development of ecological momentary interventions. In: Palmier-Claus J, Haddock G, Varese F, eds. *Novel uses of experience sampling in mental health research*. London, UK: Routledge; in press.

Table 1. ESM procedure[a], eESM task for measuring liberal acceptance bias, and ESM measures of momentary aberrant salience, negative affect, psychotic and paranoid experiences.

Domain	***eESM task***
Liberal acceptance (LA) bias	We used an eESM task for measuring liberal acceptance bias, asking individuals to provide probability estimates on four alternative response options to one knowledge question each time when an ESM assessment was scheduled. The probability estimates ranged from 0-100% and were grouped and presented as categorical variable (0%, 1-9%, 10-19% 20-29%,…, 90-99%, 100%) to reduce complexity and the potential impact of poor task comprehension. In a next step, participants were asked whether or not they want to make a decision and select one of the four alternative responses. The questions were designed to be similar to those asked in the television show *'Who Wants to Be a Millionaire'*, but selected based on their property that the likelihood for a response option being correct would seem equal across all four options (e.g. Question: "What would be the colour of Coca-Cola without colouring?"; Response options: "A: orange, B: green, C: brown, D: colourless"). Hence, in line with the rational estimate of 50% for first estimations in the beads task (with no evidence on which to base estimations),[36] the rational estimate would be 25% for any set of 4 response options in this eESM liberal acceptance task (i.e., an estimate of <20-29% on the simplified, categorical variable).
LA bias (any decision)	***Presence of liberal acceptance bias*** was ***defined as 1) any decisions made based on estimates*** of the ***likelihood of a selected response being correct below 20-29%*** and thus ***deviating below the rational estimate*** (in the absence of evidence on which to base estimations), whereas absence of liberal acceptance bias was defined as decisions made based on likelihood estimates equal to or above 20-29% (on the simplified, categorical variable) or not wanting to make a decision.
LA bias (incorrect decision)	Consistent with Moritz et al.,[16] ***incorrect decisions based on low probability estimates*** were also ***considered to be indexing presence of*** (more marked) ***liberal acceptance bias***, defined as ***2) making an incorrect decision based on estimates*** of the ***likelihood of a selected response being correct below the rational estimate*** (i.e., an estimate <20-29% on the categorical probability estimate variable).
Fluctuations in LA bias (variability, instability)	In line with previous experience sampling research,[38] ***fluctuations in liberal acceptance bias*** were operationalized as ***variability*** (i.e. differences between LA bias in the moment and the average LA bias within individuals over the 6-day assessment period, calculated as the squared difference between LA bias at each timepoint and mean LA bias within subjects over time) and ***instability*** (i.e., differences in LA bias from one moment to the next, calculated as the squared difference between LA bias at timepoint t and LA bias at timepoint t-1 within subjects and days).
	ESM measures
Experiences of aberrant novelty and salience	A modified version of the 3-item ESM measure of momentary aberrant salience by So[42] was employed, asking participants to rate the following items on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 ('not at all') to 7 ('very much')): 'Everything grabs my attention right now', 'Everything seems to have meaning right now', and 'I notice things that I haven't noticed before'.[42]
Negative affect	We used a 5-item ESM measure for assessing negative affect. This measure asks participants to rate the following items at each entry point on a 7-point Likert scale: 'I feel anxious', 'I feel down', 'I feel lonely', 'I feel insecure', and 'I feel annoyed' (Cronbach's α=0.86).[39]
Psychotic experiences	The ESM psychosis measure was used to assess intensity of psychotic experiences. It consists of eight items (i.e., 'I feel paranoid', 'I feel unreal', 'I hear things that aren't really there', 'I see things that aren't really there', 'I can't get these thoughts out of my head', 'My thoughts are influenced by others', 'It's hard to express my thoughts in words', 'I feel like I am losing control') rated on a 7-point Likert scale (Cronbach's α=0.90).[38,39,43] We observed good concurrent validity of ESM measures of negative affect and psychotic experiences (r=0.68, p<0.001).
Paranoid experiences	The item 'I feel paranoid' of the ESM psychosis measure was used to assess paranoid experiences. There was good concurrent validity for this measure of paranoid experiences with ESM measures of psychotic experiences (score calculated excluding the item 'I feel paranoid'; r=0.78, p<0.001), negative affect (r=0.67, p<0.001) and threat anticipation (r=0.54, p<0.001).

[a] **ESM procedure:** On each day over an assessment period of six consecutive days, the PsyMate® emitted ten 'beep' signals at random moments within set blocks of time. The length of time for each of these blocks was 90 minutes within which a random signal was emitted. During an initial briefing session, participants were asked to stop their activity and answer questions about thoughts, feelings, behaviours, social situations,

and neighbourhood surroundings each time the device emitted the beep signal. The ESM questionnaire was available to participants for the duration of 10 minutes after emission of the beep signal. Participants were not paid per completed response but contacted at least once during the assessment period to assess their adherence to instructions, identify any potential distress associated with the method, and maximise the number of observations per participant. At the end of the assessment period, participants' reactivity to, and compliance with, the method was examined in a debriefing session. Participants were required to provide valid responses to at least one-third of the emitted beeps, which is a very widely established criterion on the bare minimum of ESM completion for participants to be included in the analysis recommended in methodological guidelines on experience sampling methodology[41] and used in numerous experience sampling studies to date.[35,37-40] Earlier ESM studies in samples of patients with psychotic disorder,[37-40] ARMS,[40] and controls[37-40] have demonstrated the feasibility, reliability and validity of the assessment method.[35,37-41]

Table 2. Basic sample characteristics (n=150)

	FEP (n=51)	ARMS (n=46)	Controls (n=53)	Test statistic	p
Age (years), mean (S.D.)	28.3 (8.6)	23.6 (4.7)	35.0 (12.6)	F (2,147)=18.6	<0.001
Gender, n (%)					
Men	28 (54.9)	21 (45.7)	25 (47.2)	χ^2=1.0, df=2	0.612
Women	23 (45.1)	25 (54.4)	28 (52.8)		
Level of education, n (%)					
School	17 (33.3)	13 (28.9)	8 (15.1)		
Further	25 (49.0)	24 (53.3)	15 (28.3)	χ^2=24.3, df=4	<0.001
Higher	9 (17.7)	8 (17.8)	30 (56.6)		
OPCRIT Psychotic disorder diagnosis[a], n (%)					
Schizophrenia	15 (31.3)	–	–		
Delusional disorder	3 (6.3)	–	–		
Schizoaffective disorder	3 (6.3)	–	–	–	–
Manic psychosis	7 (14.6)	–	–		
Depressive psychosis	7 (14.6)	–	–		
Psychotic disorder NOS	13 (27.1)	–	–		
SCID Comorbid affective disorder diagnosis, n (%)					
Mood disorder	–	5 (10.9)	–		
Anxiety disorder	–	15 (32.6)	–	–	–
Mood and anxiety disorder	–	3 (6.5)	–		
Psychotropic medication[b], n (%)					
Antipsychotic	40 (81.6)	5 (11.9)	0 (0.0)		
Atypical	36 (76.6)	5 (11.9)	0 (0.0)		
Typical	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	–	–
Atypical and typical	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		
Antidepressant	11 (22.9)	17 (40.5)	0 (0.0)		
Other	12 (25.0)	4 (9.5)	9 (17.0)		
None	4 (8.2)	22 (52.4)	44 (83.0)		

Note: FEP, First-Episode Psychosis; ARMS, At-Risk Mental State for psychosis; S.D., standard deviation; df, degrees of freedom; OPCRIT, Operational Criteria system; SCID, Structured Clinical Interview for DSM Disorders

†OPCIT diagnoses not assessed in ARMS from EU-GEI High-Risk study

‡ SCID diagnoses not assessed in FEP and controls in the EU-GEI Functional Enviromics study

Missing values: [a]3, [b]6

§Participants included/excluded (of n=165 assessed) and reasons for exclusion:

	FEP	ARMS	Controls	Test statistic	p
Included (n=150)	51 (86.4)	46 (90.2)	53 (96.4)	χ^2=3.4, df=2	0.179
Excluded (n=15)	8 (13.6)	5 (9.8)	2 (3.6)		
Reasons for exclusion (n=15)					
Stopped ESM assessment	1	1	2		
Did not return PsyMate	0	1	0		
Technical problems	1	0	0		
≥20 valid responses	6	3	0		

Table 3. Liberal acceptance bias in FEP, ARMS, and controls

	unadj. OR	95% CI	p	adj. OR[a]	95% CI	p	adj. OR[b]	95% CI	p
Presence of liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[c]									
FEP[e]	2.17	(1.07 – 4.40)	0.032	2.11	(1.02 – 4.38)	0.043	1.98	(0.96 – 4.10)	0.066
ARMS[f]	1.63	(0.79 – 3.40)	0.186	1.52	(0.68 – 3.42)	0.312	1.29	(0.57 – 2.92)	0.546
Controls	1.00			1.00			1.00		
Presence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[d]									
FEP[e]	3.44	(1.62 – 7.31)	0.001	3.48	(1.60 – 7.57)	0.002	3.13	(1.45 – 6.78)	0.004
ARMS[f]	2.56	(1.17 – 5.59)	0.019	2.51	(1.05 – 6.00)	0.039	2.04	(0.85 – 4.92)	0.112
Controls	1.00			1.00			1.00		

Note: FEP, first-episode psychosis; ARMS, at-risk mental state for psychosis; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval

[a] Adjusted for age and gender

[b] Adjusted for age, gender, and level of education

[c] Presence of liberal acceptance bias: making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[d] Presence of liberal acceptance bias: making incorrect decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making incorrect or correct decisions based on high probability estimate (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[e]Missing values, n=1, [f]Missing values, n=2

Table 4. Association of liberal acceptance bias[a,b] with psychotic experiences, paranoid experiences and negative affect in daily life by group (FEP, ARMS, controls)[c]

	FEP[d]		ARMS[e]		Controls		LR test[d,e]	
	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	χ^2 (df)	p
	Outcome: Psychotic experiences							
Liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[a] × group[f,g]								
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias[a]	0.05 (-0.11 – 0.21)	0.540	0.27 (0.08 – 0.46)	0.005	0.03 (-0.16 – 0.23)	0.736	4.0 (2)	0.138
Liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b] × group[f,g]								
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.06 (-0.28 – 0.17)	0.616	0.07 (-0.18 – 0.33)	0.569	0.07 (-0.23 – 0.37)	0.645	0.7 (2)	0.691
	Outcome: Paranoid experiences							
Liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[a] × group[f,g]								
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias[a]	0.10 (-0.15 – 0.36)	0.423	0.39 (0.10 – 0.69)	0.009	-0.09 (-0.39 – 0.22)	0.572	5.1 (2)	0.080
Liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b] × group[f,g]								
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.03 (-0.30 – 0.24)	0.833	0.23 (-0.09 – 0.55)	0.158	-0.05 (-0.46 – 0.36)	0.801	1.8 (2)	0.407
	Outcome: Negative affect							
Liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[a] × group[f,g]								
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias[a]	0.06 (-0.18 – 0.30)	0.633	-0.10 (-0.37 – 0.18)	0.486	-0.17 (-0.45 – 0.11)	0.237	1.6 (2)	0.449
Liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b] × group[f,g]								
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	0.06 (-0.19 – 0.32)	0.626	-0.19 (-0.49 – 0.12)	0.236	-0.20 (-0.59 – 0.18)	0.299	2.0 (2)	0.360

Note: FEP, First-Episode Psychosis; ARMS, At-Risk Mental State for psychosis; df, degrees of freedom; vs., versus; CI, confidence interval; LR, likelihood ratio for interaction

[a] Presence of liberal acceptance bias (any decision): making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[b] Presence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions): making incorrect decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making incorrect or correct decisions based on high probability estimate (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[c] Adjusted for age, gender, and level of education

[d]Missing values, n=1, [e]Missing values, n=2

[f] Two-way interaction for liberal acceptance bias × group as included in the following model, with y_{ij} for psychotic or paranoid experiences or negative affect as outcome variable: $y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{LIBERAL ACCEPTANCE BIAS}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_3(\text{LIBERAL ACCEPTANCE BIAS}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \varepsilon_{ij}$ (full model not shown and available upon request)

[g] Difference in associations across groups for significant for two-way interaction for liberal acceptance bias × group:

	FEP vs. controls		*ARMS vs. controls*		*FEP vs. ARMS*	
	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p
			Outcome: Psychotic experiences			
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[a]	0.02 (-0.24 – 0.27)	0.890	0.24 (-0.03 – 0.51)	0.082	-0.22 (-0.47 – 0.03)	0.081
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.13 (-0.50 – 0.25)	0.503	0.00 (-0.39 – 0.40)	0.986	-0.13 (-0.47 – 0.21)	0.448
			Outcome: Paranoid experiences			
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[a]	0.19 (-0.21 – 0.59)	0.343	0.48 (0.06 – 0.91)	0.026	-0.29 (-0.68 – 0.10)	0.144
Presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	0.02 (-0.47 – 0.52)	0.923	0.28 (-0.24 – 0.81)	0.286	-0.26 (-0.68 – 0.16)	0.222

Table 5. Association between momentary aberrant salience, psychotic and paranoid experiences by liberal acceptance (LA) bias[a] and group (FEP, ARMS, controls)[b]

	FEP[c]		ARMS[d]		Controls		LR test[c,d]	
	adj. β (95% CI)	P	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	χ^2 (df)	p
	Outcome: Psychotic experiences							
Momentary aberrant salience × LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[e,f]							7.40 (2)	0.025
Association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences by LA bias:								
Presence of LA bias	0.16 (0.06 – 0.25)	0.001	0.36 (0.27 – 0.46)	<0.001	0.15 (0.04 – 0.27)	0.008		
Absence of LA bias	0.20 (0.17 – 0.22)	<0.001	0.24 (0.21 – 0.26)	<0.001	0.18 (0.15 – 0.22)	<0.001		
Presence vs. absence	-0.04 (-0.13 – 0.05)	0.400	0.13 (0.03 – 0.22)	0.008	-0.03 (-0.14 – 0.08)	0.600		
	Outcome: Paranoid experiences							
Momentary aberrant salience × LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[e,f]							3.7 (2)	0.160
Association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences by LA bias:								
Presence of LA bias	0.08 (-0.07 -0.24)	0.273	0.32 (0.17 – 0.47)	<0.001	0.10 (-0.08 – 0.28)	0.291		
Absence of LA bias	0.19 (0.14 – 0.23)	<0.001	0.23 (0.18 – 0.28)	<0.001	0.17 (0.11 – 0.23)	<0.001		
Presence vs. absence	-0.10 (-0.25 – 0.05)	0.188	0.09 (-0.05 – 0.24)	0.215	-0.07 (-0.25 – 0.11)	0.451		

Note: FEP, First-Episode Psychosis; ARMS, At-Risk Mental State for psychosis; LA bias, liberal acceptance bias; df, degrees of freedom; vs., versus; CI, confidence interval; LR, likelihood ratio for interaction

[a] Presence of liberal acceptance bias (any decision): making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision)

[b] Adjusted for age, gender, and level of education

[c] Missing values, n=1, [d]Missing values, n=2

[e] Three-way interaction for momentary aberrant salience × liberal acceptance bias × group as included in the following model (with y_{ij} for psychotic experiences or paranoid experienes as outcome variable): $y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{LIBERAL ACCEPTANCE BIAS}_{ij}) + \beta_3(\text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_4(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij} \times \text{LIBERAL ACCEPTANCE BIAS}_{ij}) + \beta_5(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_6(\text{LIBERAL ACCEPTANCE BIAS}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_7(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij} \times \text{LIBERAL ACCEPTANCE BIAS}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \varepsilon_{ij}$ (full model not shown and available upon request)

[f] Difference (Δ) in associations of momentary aberrant salience with i) psychotic and ii) paranoid experiences in the presence vs. absence of liberal acceptance bias across groups:

	FEP vs. controls		*ARMS vs. controls*		*ARMS vs. FEP*	
	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	P	adj. β (95% CI)	p
			Outcome: psychotic experiences			
Δ in associations in the presence vs. absence of LA bias (any decision) across groups	-0.01 (-0.16 – 0.14)	0.891	0.16 (0.01 – 0.30)	0.034	0.17 (0.04 – 0.30)	0.013
			Outcome: paranoid experiences			
Δ in associations in the presence vs. absence of LA bias (any decision) across groups	-0.03 (-0.27 – 0.20)	0.781	0.16 (-0.07 – 0.40)	0.171	0.20 (-0.02 – 0.41)	0.071

Supplementary Table 1. Aggregate ESM scores for stress, negative affect, momentary aberrant salience, threat anticipation and psychotic experiences in FEP, ARMS, and controls

	FEP	ARMS[a]	Controls	FEP vs. controls		ARMS vs. controls	
	Mean (S.D.)	Mean (S.D.)	Mean (S.D.)	B (95% CI)	p	B (95% CI)	p
Psychotic experiences	2.55 (1.27)	2.40 (1.13)	1.47 (0.59)	1.08 (1.01 – 1.15)	<0.001	0.93 (0.86 – 1.01)	<0.001
Paranoid experiences	2.47 (1.52)	2.59 (1.50)	1.40 (0.62)	1.07 (0.97 – 1.16)	<0.001	1.19 (1.09 – 1.28)	<0.001
Momentary aberrant salience	2.87 (1.27)	2.40 (1.13)	2.19 (1.22)	0.68 (0.59 – 0.77)	<0.001	0.21 (0.12 – 0.31)	<0.001
Negative affect	3.04 (1.23)	3.0 (1.08)	1.91 (0.70)	1.13 (1.05 – 1.21)	<0.001	1.10 (1.02 – 1.18)	<0.001

Note: ESM, Experience Sampling Method; FEP, First-Episode Psychosis; ARMS, At-Risk Mental State for psychosis; S.D., standard deviation; CI, confidence interval

	FEP	ARMS	Controls
Compliance[b] (number of valid responses, overall 6064 (67.4%) valid observations of 9000 possible ESM observations)			
Mean	36.16	39.13	45.66
S.D.	10.10	10.31	8.16
Range (Min – Max)	37 (20 – 57)	39 (21 – 60)	35 (23 – 58)
Mean percentage within participants	60.3% (33.3 – 95.0%)	65.2% (35.0% – 100%)	76.1% (38.3% – 96.7%)
Perceived assessment burden, mean (S.D.)	3.72 (1.56)	3.92 (1.56)	3.73 (1.36)
Completed ESM assessment days, n(%)			
6 days	50 (98.0)	45 (97.8)	53 (100.0)
Less than 6 days	1 (2.0)	1 (2.2)	0 (0.0)

[a] ARMS criteria: 1) Schizotypal personality disorder plus a recent decline in function (defined as i) a 30% drop in the Social and Occupational Functioning Assessment Scale (SOFAS) score from premorbid level, sustained for 1 month, and occurring within past 12 months; or ii) a SOFAS score of 50 or less for past 12 months or longer); 2) First degree relative with psychosis plus a recent decline in function (see above); 3) 'Attenuated' positive psychotic symptoms; 4) Brief psychotic episode of less than one week duration that resolves without antipsychotic medication

[b] Please see Reininghaus et al.[9] for a more detailed discussion of compliance in the current study.

Supplementary Table 2. Liberal acceptance bias[a,b] between and within FEP, ARMS, and controls over the 6-day assessment period

	FEP[c]	ARMS[d]	Controls
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Presence of liberal acceptance bias[a]			
Between, n(%)	25 (50.0)	24 (54.6)	28 (52.8)
Within, %	19.9	13.4	8.6
Intraclass correlation (95% CI)	0.49 (0.32-0.66)	0.35 (0.19-0.55)	0.11 (0.03-0.37)
Presence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[b]			
Between, n(%)	23 (46.0)	22 (52.2)	18 (34.0)
Within, %	22.4	17.4	16.4
Intraclass correlation (95% CI)	0.44 (0.26-0.63)	0.28 (0.13-0.51)	0.07 (0.002-.76)

Note: FEP, first-episode psychosis; ARMS, at-risk mental state for psychosis; CI, confidence interval

[a] Presence of liberal acceptance bias: making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[b] Presence of liberal acceptance bias: making incorrect decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making incorrect or correct decisions based on high probability estimate (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[c]Missing values, n=1, [d]Missing values, n=2

†Explanatory Note: The proportion of individuals ever showing presence of liberal acceptance bias (i.e., at least once) in the 6-day assessment period was similar across FEP (between, 50.0%), ARMS (between, 54.6%), and controls (between, 52.8%). For those individuals ever showing presence of liberal acceptance bias, this was, on average, the case for 19.9% of responses by FEP over the assessment period, compared with 13.4% of responses by ARMS and only 8.6% of response by controls (see within percent). When we examined liberal acceptance bias based on making *incorrect* decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates, a higher proportion of FEP (between, 46.0%) and ARMS (between, 52.2%) than controls (between, 34.0) ever showed presence of liberal acceptance bias. For those individuals ever showing presence of liberal acceptance bias based on making incorrect decisions, this was, on average, the case for 22.4% of responses by FEP over the assessment period, compared with 17.4% of responses by ARMS and 16.4% of response by controls (see within percent).

Supplementary Table 3. Fluctuations liberal acceptance bias in FEP, ARMS, and controls

	unadj. β	95% CI	p	adj. β[a]	95% CI	p	adj. β[b]	95% CI	p
Fluctuations in liberal acceptance bias (any decision)[c]									
Variability[e]									
FEP[g] vs. controls	0.02	0.004-0.04	0.020	0.02	0.002-0.04	0.029	0.02	0.001-0.04	0.044
ARMS[h] vs. controls	0.01	-0.005-0.03	0.142	0.01	-0.01-0.03	0.253	0.01	-0.01-0.03	0.452
Instability[f]									
FEP[g] vs. controls	0.04	0.003-0.08	0.035	0.04	-0.0001-0.08	0.056	0.03	-0.01-0.07	0.093
ARMS[g] vs. controls	0.03	-0.006-0.07	0.094	0.03	-0.01-0.07	0.193	0.02	-0.02-0.06	0.398
Fluctuations in liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions)[d]									
Variability[e]									
FEP[g] vs. controls	0.02	0.01-0.04	0.002	0.03	0.01-0.04	0.002	0.02	0.01-0.04	0.005
ARMS[h] vs. controls	0.02	0.0001-0.03	0.048	0.02	-0.002-0.03	0.082	0.01	-0.01-0.03	0.194
Instability[f]									
FEP[g] vs. controls	0.05	0.02-0.09	0.003	0.05	0.02-0.09	0.005	0.05	0.01-0.09	0.014
ARMS[h] vs. controls	0.04	-0.001-0.07	0.057	0.03	-0.008-0.08	0.111	0.02	-0.02-0.07	0.256

Note: FEP, first-episode psychosis; ARMS, at-risk mental state for psychosis; CI, confidence interval

[a] Adjusted for age and gender

[b] Adjusted for age, gender, and level of education

[c] Presence of liberal acceptance bias (any decision): making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[d] Presence of liberal acceptance bias (incorrect decisions): making incorrect decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making incorrect or correct decisions based on high probability estimate (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[e] Variability: differences between LA bias in the moment and the average LA bias within individuals over the 6-day assessment period, calculated as the squared difference between LA bias at each timepoint and mean LA bias within subjects over time

[f] Differences in LA bias from one moment to the next, calculated as the squared difference between LA bias at timepoint t and LA bias at timepoint t-1 within subjects and days

[g]Missing values, n=1, [h]Missing values, n=2

Supplementary Table 4. Association of fluctuations (variability, instability) in liberal acceptance LA bias[a,b] with psychotic experiences, paranoid experiences and negative affect by group[c]

	FEP[d]		ARMS[e]		Controls		Wald test	
	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	χ^2 (df)	p
			Outcome: Psychotic experiences					
Fluctuations in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[f,g]								
Variability[d] in LA bias (any decision)[a]	0.00 (-0.26 – 0.26)	0.987	0.36 (0.10 – 0.62)	0.007	0.03 (-0.21 – 0.27)	0.793	4.6 (2)	0.100
Instability[e] in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.07 (-0.27 – 0.13)	0.484	0.37 (0.16 – 0.58)	<0.001	0.02 (-0.18 – 0.22)	0.854	10.2(2)	0.006
Fluctuations in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b] × group[f,g]								
Variability[d] in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.10 (-0.39 – 0.19)	0.511	0.08 (-0.22 – 0.38)	0.601	0.08 (-0.26 – 0.41)	0.645	0.9 (2)	0.639
Instability[e] in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.12 (-0.37 – 0.12)	0.332	0.12 (-0.14 – 0.38)	0.373	0.15 (-0.14 – 0.44)	0.315	2.6 (2)	0.280
			Outcome: Paranoid experiences					
Fluctuations in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[f,g]								
Variability[d] in LA bias (any decision)[a]	0.05 (-0.34 – 0.43)	0.817	0.54 (0.15 – 0.93)	0.006	-0.09 (-0.44 – 0.27)	0.632	5.9 (2)	0.052
Instability[e] in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.10 (-0.35 – 0.16)	0.463	0.31 (0.05 – 0.58)	0.022	-0.05 (-0.31 – 0.21)	0.686	5.6 (2)	0.061
Fluctuations in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b] × group[f,g]								
Variability[d] in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.09 (-0.46 – 0.29)	0.649	0.25 (-0.13 – 0.64)	0.200	-0.05 (-0.50 – 0.39)	0.814	1.8 (2)	0.412
Instability[e] in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.14 (-0.41 – 0.14)	0.326	0.17 (-0.13 – 0.47)	0.258	0.01 (-0.34 – 0.35)	0.968	2.2 (2)	0.326
			Outcome: Negative affect					
Fluctuations in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[f,g]								
Variability[d] in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.00 (-0.35 – 0.35)	0.996	-0.08 (-0.44 – 0.27)	0.645	-0.18 (-0.51 – 0.14)	0.265	0.6 (2)	0.750
Instability[e] in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.09 (-0.37 – 0.18)	0.516	0.23 (-0.06 – 0.52)	0.120	-0.03 (-0.30 – 0.25)	0.854	2.7 (2)	0.255
Fluctuations in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b] × group[f,g]								
Variability[d] in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.02 (-0.40 – 0.35)	0.905	-0.22 (-0.61 – 0.17)	0.261	-0.20 (-0.64 – 0.24)	0.379	0.6 (2)	0.735
Instability[e] in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.14 (-0.46 – 0.17)	0.375	0.10 (-0.24 – 0.44)	0.556	-0.02 (-0.40 – 0.36)	0.917	1.1 (2)	0.585

Note: FEP, First-Episode Psychosis; ARMS, At-Risk Mental State for psychosis; df, degrees of freedom; vs., versus; CI, confidence interval

[a] LA bias defined making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of LA bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[b] LA bias defined making incorrect decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of LA bias defined as making incorrect or correct decisions based on high probability estimate (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision

[c] Adjusted for age, gender, and level of education

[d] Variability: Differences between momentary LA bias and the average LA bias within individuals over the 6-day assessment period (i.e., squared difference between LA bias at each timepoint and mean LA bias within subjects over time)

[e] Instability: Differences in LA bias from one moment to the next, calculated as the squared difference between LA bias at timepoint t and LA bias at timepoint t-1 within subjects and days

[f] Two-way interaction for fluctuation in LA bias × group as included in the following model, with y_{ij} for psychotic or paranoid experiences or negative affect as outcome variable: $y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{FLUCTUATION IN LA BIAS}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_3(\text{FLUCTUATION IN LA BIAS}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \varepsilon_{ij}$ (full model not shown and available upon request)

[g] Difference in associations across groups for significant for two-way interaction for LA bias × group:

	FEP vs. controls		*ARMS vs. controls*		*FEP vs. ARMS*	
	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p
			Outcome: Psychotic experiences			

Fluctuations in LA bias (any decision)[a]						
Variability in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.03 (-0.38 – 0.32)	0.868	0.33 (-0.02 – 0.68)	0.068	-0.36 (-0.73 – 0.01)	0.055
Instability in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.09 (-0.37 – 0.19)	0.532	0.35 (0.07 – 0.64)	0.015	-0.44 (-0.72 - -0.16)	0.002
Fluctuations in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]						
Variability in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.18 (-0.62 – 0.27)	0.437	0.00 (-0.45 – 0.45)	0.996	-0.18 (-0.59 – 0.24)	0.405
Instability in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.27 (-0.65 – 0.11)	0.164	-0.03 (-0.42 – 0.36)	0.881	-0.24 (-0.60 – 0.12)	0.189
			Outcome: Paranoid experiences			
Fluctuations in LA bias (any decision)[a]						
Variability in LA bias (any decision)[a]	0.13 (-0.39 – 0.65)	0.620	0.63 (0.10 – 1.16)	0.019	-0.50 (-1.04 – 0.05)	0.074
Instability in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.41 (-0.41 – 0.32)	0.824	0.37 (-0.01 – 0.74)	0.054	-0.41 (-0.78 - -0.04)	0.030
Fluctuations in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]						
Variability in LA bias (incorrect decisions)[b]	-0.03 (-0.62 – 0.55)	0.910	0.31 (-0.29 – 0.90)	0.309	-0.34 (-0.88 – 0.20)	0.216
Instability in LA bias (any decision)[a]	-0.15 (-0.59 – 0.30)	0.519	0.17 (-0.29 – 0.62)	0.478	-0.31 (-0.72 – 0.10)	0.134

Table 5. Association between momentary aberrant salience, psychotic and paranoid experiences by fluctuations (variability, instability) in liberal acceptance (LA) bias[a] and group[b]

	FEP[c]		ARMS[d]		Controls		Wald test	
	adj. β (95% CI)	P	adj. β (95% CI)	p	adj. β (95% CI)	p	χ^2 (df)	p
	Outcome: Psychotic experiences							
Momentary aberrant salience × variability[c] in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[e]							7.6 (2)	0.022
Association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences by variability[c] in LA bias:								
High variability in LA bias	0.31 (0.26 – 0.37)	<0.001	0.42 (0.37 – 0.48)	<0.001	0.28 (0.22 – 0.35)	<0.001		
Low variability in LA bias	0.30 (0.25 – 0.35)	<0.001	0.33 (0.27 – 0.38)	<0.001	0.30 (0.23 – 0.36)	<0.001		
High vs. low	0.01 (-0.05 – 0.08)	0.667	0.10 (0.04 – 0.16)	0.001	-0.01 (-0.07 – 0.05)	0.652		
Momentary aberrant salience × instability[d] in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[e]							6.4 (2)	0.041
Association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences by instability[d] in LA bias:								
High instability in LA bias	0.31 (0.25 – 0.37)	<0.001	0.42 (0.36 – 0.48)	<0.001	0.26 (0.18 – 0.33)	<0.001		
Low instability in LA bias	0.28 (0.22 – 0.34)	<0.001	0.29 (0.23 – 0.35)	<0.001	0.27 (0.19 – 0.35)	<0.001		
High vs. low	0.04 (-0.04 – 0.11)	0.313	0.12 (0.05 – 0.20)	0.001	-0.01 (-0.10 – 0.07)	0.742		
	Outcome: Paranoid experiences							
Momentary aberrant salience × variability[c] in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[e]							5.4 (2)	0.067
Association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences by variability[c] in LA bias:								
High variability in LA bias	0.26 (0.17 – 0.34)	<0.001	0.40 (0.32 – 0.49)	<0.001	0.25 (0.14 – 0.35)	<0.001		
Low variability in LA bias	0.32 (0.23 – 0.40)	<0.001	0.31 (0.23 – 0.40)	<0.001	0.28 (0.17 – 0.39)	<0.001		
High vs. low	-0.06 (-0.16 – 0.04)	0.210	0.09 (-0.01 – 0.18)	0.068	-0.03 (-0.13 – 0.06)	0.481		
Momentary aberrant salience × instability[d] in LA bias (any decision)[a] × group[e]							1.2 (2)	0.556
Association between momentary aberrant salience and psychotic experiences by instability[d] in LA bias:								
High instability in LA bias	0.25 (0.15 – 0.35)	<0.001	0.35 (0.25 – 0.44)	<0.001	0.22 (0.10 – 0.35)	<0.001		
Low instability in LA bias	0.30 (0.20 – 0.40)	<0.001	0.32 (0.22 – 0.41)	<0.001	0.25 (0.13 – 0.38)	<0.001		
High vs. low	-0.05 (-0.16 – 0.06)	0.389	0.03 (-0.07 – 0.13)	0.558	-0.03 (-0.14 – 0.09)	0.615		

Note: FEP, First-Episode Psychosis; ARMS, At-Risk Mental State for psychosis; df, degrees of freedom; vs., versus; CI, confidence interval

[a] Liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on probability estimates that deviate below rational estimates (<20-29%); Reference category: absence of liberal acceptance bias defined as making decisions based on high probability estimates (≥20-29%) or not wanting to make a decision)

[b] Adjusted for age, gender, and level of education

[c] Variability: Differences between momentary LA bias and the average LA bias within individuals over the 6-day assessment period (i.e., squared difference between LA bias at each timepoint and mean LA bias within subjects over time)

[d] Instability: Differences in LA bias from one moment to the next, calculated as the squared difference between LA bias at timepoint t and LA bias at timepoint t-1 within subjects and days

[e] Three-way interaction for momentary aberrant salience × liberal acceptance bias × group as included in the following model (with y_{ij} for psychotic experiences or paranoid experienes as outcome variable): $y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij}) + \beta_2(\text{FLUCTUATION IN LA BIAS}_{ij}) + \beta_3(\text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_4(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij} \times \text{FLUCTUATION IN LA BIAS}_{ij}) + \beta_5(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_6(\text{FLUCTUATION IN LA BIAS}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \beta_7(\text{MOMENTARY ABERRANT SALIENCE}_{ij} \times \text{FLUCTUATION IN LA BIAS}_{ij} \times \text{GROUP}_j) + \varepsilon_{ij}$ (full model not shown and available upon request)